III. REMARKS

Claims 1-2 and 4-39 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 11, 18, and 29 have been amended. Applicants are not conceding in this application that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Office, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the subject matter noted by the Office. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, and 4-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levergood et al. (US 5,708,780) in view of Applicant's own alleged admitted prior art (AAPA) and further in view of Abdo et al. (US 7,080,404). Applicants traverse the rejection on the following grounds.

With respect to independent claim 1, Applicants assert that Levergood in view of AAPA and Abdo does not disclose each and every feature of the claim. For example, Levergood in view of AAPA and further in view of Abdo does not disclose, *inter alia*, "generating a **single** security value for an authenticated user … and the security value is a pseudo-random number." See claim 1. (Emphasis added). Applicants understand the Office to assert that the SID of Levergood allegedly teaches the security value of claim 1. See Final Office Action, page 3 ("i.e., SID is generated for an authenticated user"). However, the Office admits that Levergood fails to teach "generating a security value for an authenticated user of the distributed application, wherein

every user is authenticated prior to generating the security value and the security value is a pseudo-random number." See Office Action, page 4. The Office asserts that Col. 4, lines 18-53 of Abdo allegedly teaches this feature. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Office's assertion. In this section, Abdo discloses "generating and sharing auto-reconnect data … [which] comprises **a session ID number and a first random number**. … The session ID is a number that is **associated with the client's current server session** and that is unique among currently executing sessions. The first random number is a 16-byte number that is generated using a cryptographically secure random number generator, and might include pseudo-random numbers." See Col. 6, lines 43-53. Applicants contend that the auto-reconnect data fails to teach the features of the security value of claim 1.

First, Applicants submit that the auto-reconnect data of Abdo is comprised of two different values: the session ID number and the first random number. In sharp contrast, claim 1 recites "generating a **single** security value." (Emphasis added). Second, Applicants submit that Abdo discloses the auto-reconnect data is for a *server session*. In contrast, claim 1 recites "generating a single security value **for an authenticated user.**" (Emphasis added). Accordingly, Applicants maintain that the cited references fail to teach the security value of claim 1.

Applicants also contend that Levergood in view of AAPA and further in view of Abdo fails to disclose "determining of the one command is required to be associated with the security value; executing the one command if the one command is not required to be associated with the security value; and if the one command is required to be associated with the security value:…."

See claim 1. Applicants submit that none of the cited references discloses this feature of claim 1. Support for this feature can be found in the Application, paragraph [0026], page 11.

Furthermore, Applicants submit that Levergood in view of AAPA and further in view of Abdo does not provide "preventing execution of the one command if the security value is not found with the one command **or if there is an error in the security value**; and returning an error message to the authenticated user if the security value is not found with the one command **or if there is an error in the security value**." See claim 1. (Emphasis added). The Office asserts that Levergood allegedly teaches the feature of preventing execution of the command if the security value is not found and returning an error message to the authentication user for confirmation before the command is executed. Specifically, the Office points to Col. 5, lines 41-49, Col. 6, lines 26-65, and Col. 7, lines 65-47 of Levergood. However, Applicants maintain that Levergood fails to teach this feature and submit that Levergood, in addition to AAPA and Abdo, does not teach determining there is an error in the SID (which the Office points to as allegedly teaching the security value). Accordingly, Applicants assert that the cited references fail to teach each and every feature of claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, claim 1 patently distinguishes over Levergood, AAPA, and Abdo individually or in combination, and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Levergood in view of AAPA and further in view of Abdo be withdrawn.

With respect to independent claim 11, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and Applicants assert that Levergood in view of AAPA and Abdo does not disclose each and every feature of the claim. Claim 11 recites:

"A method for protecting a distributed application user, comprising: …

generating, on a server, a **single** security value **for the authenticated user**, wherein the security value is a pseudo-random number; …

determining if the one command is required to be associated with the security value;

executing the one command if the one command is not required to be associated with the security value; and

if the one command is required to be associated with the security value:

checking the one URL for the security value to determine if the one URL originated from the authenticated user;

preventing execution of the command corresponding to the one URL if the security value is not found with one URL **or if there is an error in the security value**; and

returning an error message to the authenticated user if the security value is not found with the one URL **or if there is an error in the security value,** wherein the error message prompts the authenticated user for confirmation before the one URL can be executed." (Emphasis added).

For reasons that should be clear from the discussion of Levergood, AAPA, and Abdo set forth above, the combination of Levergood, AAPA, and Abdo does not disclose or suggest the method recited in claim 11, including the limitations "generating, on a service, a single security value for the authenticated user;" "determining if the one command is required to be associated with the security value;" "executing the one command if the one command is not required to be

associated with the security value;" and "if there is an error in the security value." Rather, Abdo discloses an auto-reconnect data that is comprised of two different values and is for a server session. Further, the cited references fail to provide the determining feature and executing feature of claim 11 and do not disclose "if there is an error in the security value."

In view of the foregoing, claim 11 patently distinguishes over Levergood, AAPA, and Abdo individually or in combination, and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Levergood in view of AAPA and further in view of Abdo be withdrawn.

With respect to independent claim 18, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and Applicants assert that Levergood in view of AAPA and Abdo does not disclose each and every feature of the claim. Claim 18 recites:

"A system for protecting a distributed application user, comprising: …

a security value system for generating a **single** security value **for an authenticated user** of a distributed application provided on a server, wherein every user is authenticated prior to generating the security value and the security value is a pseudo-random number; …

a command checking system for:

determining if the one command is required to be associated with the security value and executing the one command if the one command is not required to be associated with the security value; and

if the one command is required to be associated with the security value:

checking one of the set of commands received on the server from

the authenticated user for the security value to determine if the one

command originated from the authenticated user,

preventing execution of the one command if the security value is

not found with the one command **or if there is an error in the security**

value, and

returning an error message to the authenticated user if the security

value is not found with the one command **or if there is an error in the**

security value, wherein the error message prompts the authenticated user

for confirmation before the one command can be executed." (Emphasis

added).

For reasons that should be clear from the discussion of Levergood, AAPA, and Abdo set

forth above, the combination of Levergood, AAPA, and Abdo does not disclose or suggest the

system recited in claim 18, including the limitations "generating a single security value for an

authenticated user;" "determining if the one command is required to be associated with the

security value;" "executing the one command if the one command is not required to be associated

with the security value;" and "if there is an error in the security value." Rather, Abdo discloses

an auto-reconnect data that is comprised of two different values and is for a server session.

Further, the cited references fail to provide the determining feature and executing feature of

claim 18 and do not disclose "if there is an error in the security value."

In view of the foregoing, claim 18 patently distinguishes over Levergood, AAPA, and

Abdo individually or in combination, and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of

claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Levergood in view of AAPA and further in view of Abdo be withdrawn.

With respect to independent claim 29, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and Applicants assert that Levergood in view of AAPA and Abdo does not disclose each and every feature of the claim. Claim 29 recites:

"A computer program product stored on a computer readable medium for protecting a distributed application user, which when executed, comprises:

program code for generating a **single** security value **for an authenticated user** of the distributed application provided on a server, wherein every user is authenticated prior to generating the security value and the security value is a pseudo-random number; …

program code for determining if the one command is required to be associated with the security value;

program code for executing the one command if the one command is not required to be associated with the security value; and

if the one command is required to be associated with the security value:

program code for checking one of the set of commands received on the server from the authenticated user for the security value to determine if the one command originated from the authenticated user, for preventing execution of the one command if the security value is not found with the one command **or if there is an error in the security value,** and for returning an error message to the authenticated user if the security value is not found with the one command **or if there is an error in the security value,**

wherein the error message prompts the authenticated user for confirmation before the one command can be executed." (Emphasis added).

For reasons that should be clear from the discussion of Levergood, AAPA, and Abdo set forth above, the combination of Levergood, AAPA, and Abdo does not disclose or suggest the system recited in claim 29, including the limitations "generating a single security value for an authenticated user;" "determining if the one command is required to be associated with the security value;" "executing the one command if the one command is not required to be associated with the security value;" and "if there is an error in the security value." Rather, Abdo discloses an auto-reconnect data that is comprised of two different values and is for a server session. Further, the cited references fail to provide the determining feature and executing feature of claim 29 and do not disclose "if there is an error in the security value."

In view of the foregoing, claim 29 patently distinguishes over Levergood, AAPA, and Abdo individually or in combination, and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Levergood in view of AAPA and further in view of Abdo be withdrawn.

With regard to the Office's other arguments regarding dependent claims, Applicant herein incorporates the arguments presented above with respect to independent claims listed above. In addition, Applicant submits that all dependant claims are allowable based on their own distinct features. However, for brevity, Applicant will forego addressing each of these rejections individually, but reserves the right to do so should it become necessary. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw its rejection.

IV. CONCLUSION

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 3, 2008

__/Elaine Chi/_____
Elaine Chi
Reg. No.: 61,194

Hoffman Warnick LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)